

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-16 and 18-22 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 12, 19 and 20 being the independent claims. No claims are sought to be cancelled. New claims 21 and 22 are sought to be added. No claims are sought to be amended.

Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

***Eng in view of Rakib in view of Mobley – Claim 19***

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,557 to Eng *et al.* (hereafter "*Eng*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,298,762 to Rakib *et al.* (hereafter "*Rakib*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,218,901 to Mobley *et al.* (hereafter "*Mobley*"). *Office Action at p. 2.* Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 19 recites in part "wherein said serial packet sync encoder comprises a serial packet sync transmitter that transmits said serial packet sync datastream on **a single pin** as an indication that said grant has arrived." As the Examiner concedes, the *Eng-Rakib* combination fails to teach a "datastream on **a single pin**," as recited in claim 19. *Office Action at p. 3 (emphasis added).* However, the Examiner asserts that the *Eng-Rakib-Mobley* combination is a valid combination, and that *Mobley* remedies the above deficiency of the *Eng-Rakib* combination by teaching or suggesting

data transmission via "a smaller number of interface pairs [sic] on a chip." *Office Action at pp. 3-4.*

Applicant respectfully submits that *Mobley* does not recite the feature of a "datastream on a **single pin** as an indication that said grant has arrived." *Mobley* discloses an "architecture for providing high-speed access over frequency-division multiplexed (FDM) channels allow[ing] transmission of ethernet frames ... across a cable transmission network." *Mobley, Abstract.* Specifically, *Mobley* discloses the direct connection of two 802.3 interfaces using an "ethernet cross-over cable" constructed by crossing pins 1 and 3, as well as pins 2 and 6 of an RJ45 connector. *See Mobley, Col. 16, Lns. 15-20.* In addition, *Mobley* discloses the use of a mux 4432 and a demux 4434 to reduce the number of pins to "a relatively smaller number of interface pins on a chip." *See Mobley, Col. 75, Lns. 41-45.* In both of these examples, at best, *Mobley* discloses a **plurality of pins** used for data transmission. In fact, nowhere does *Mobley* disclose "datastream on a **single pin** as an indication that said grant has arrived," as recited in claim 19. Disclosing a "smaller number of interface pins" simply does not teach "a single pin." Absent such a teaching in the *Eng-Rakib* combination or *Mobley*, and therefore in the asserted *Eng-Rakib-Mobley* combination, claim 19 is therefore not rendered obvious and therefore Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Eng in view of Mobley in view of Bernath – Claim 20***

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,557 to Eng *et al.* (hereafter "*Eng*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,218,901 to Mobley *et al.* (hereafter "*Mobley*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,629,288 to Bernath *et al.* (hereafter "*Bernath*"). *Office Action at p. 4.* Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 20 recites in part "a serial packet sync receiver that receives a serial packet sync datastream on **a single pin**." As the Examiner concedes, *Eng* fails to teach a "datastream on **a single pin**," as recited in claim 20. *Office Action at p. 4.* However, the Examiner asserts that the *Eng-Mobley* combination is a valid combination, and that *Mobley* remedies the above deficiency of the *Eng* by teaching or suggesting data transmission via "a smaller number of interface pains [sic] on a chip." *Office Action at pp. 4-5.*

Applicant respectfully submits that *Mobley* does not recite the feature of a "serial packet sync datastream on **a single pin**." *Mobley* discloses an "architecture for providing high-speed access over frequency-division multiplexed (FDM) channels allow[ing] transmission of ethernet frames ... across a cable transmission network." *Mobley, Abstract.* Specifically, *Mobley* discloses the direct connection of two 802.3 interfaces using an "ethernet cross-over cable" constructed by crossing pins 1 and 3, as well as pins 2 and 6 of an RJ45 connector. *See Mobley, Col. 16, Lns. 15-20.* In addition, *Mobley* discloses the use of a mux 4432 and a demux 4434 to reduce the number of pins to "a relatively smaller number of interface pins on a chip." *See Mobley, Col. 75, Lns. 41-45.* In both of these examples, at best, *Mobley* discloses a **plurality of pins** used for data transmission. In fact, nowhere does *Mobley* disclose "a serial packet sync receiver that receives a serial packet sync datastream on a single pin," as recited in claim 20. Disclosing a "smaller number of interface pins" simply does not teach "a single pin." Absent such a teaching in the *Eng-Rakib* combination or *Mobley*, and therefore in the

asserted *Eng-Rakib-Mobley* combination, claim 20 is therefore not rendered obvious and therefore Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, *Bernath* does not disclose this feature. *Bernath* discloses a programmable media access controller (MAC) in order to reduce the computational burden. See *Bernath, Abstract*. Nowhere does *Bernath* disclose "a serial packet sync receiver that receives a serial packet sync datastream on a single pin," as recited in claim 20. Absent this teaching in *Eng*, *Mobley* or *Bernath*, and therefore in the asserted *Eng-Mobley-Bernath* combination, claim 20 is therefore not rendered obvious and therefore Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1-16 and 18 are allowed.

***New Claims***

Newly presented dependent claims 21 and 22 have been added to provide Applicant with additional scope of protection commensurate with the disclosure. Support for claims 21 and 22 may be found in numerous places in the original disclosure, e.g. at paragraph numbers [0057] and [0060]. Applicant submits that newly presented dependent claims 21 and 22 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claims 19 and 20 from which they directly depend, and further in view of their own respective features.

Reply to Office Action of January 15, 2009

Robert J. Lee  
Appl. No. 10/689,935

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of these newly presented claims 21 and 22 and passage through to allowance.

### ***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michael D. Specht  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 54,463

Date: April 14, 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

935749\_2.DOC